

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION:

Claims 1-26 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

In the Office Action, at page 2, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 6-11, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hayes et al. (US 2002/0123312). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. Applicant traverses this rejection and respectfully requests reconsideration.

Independent claim 1 recites "...a first radiator connected to the ground plane and extending in a first direction, spaced from the ground plane; and a second radiator connected to the first radiator, spaced from the first radiator, extending, unsupported, in the first direction, and having an end connected to an antenna cable."

Independent claim 8 recites "...a first radiator connected to the ground plane and extending in a first direction, with a predetermined separation from the ground plane; a second radiator connected at a first end thereof to the first radiator and extending, unsupported, in the first direction; and an antenna cable connected to a second end of the second radiator."

The Examiner on page 2 of the Office Action relies on figure 4A where the alleged second radiator 42a is connected to the alleged first radiator 42b (paragraph 40; figs. 4B-4C). Hayes does not teach or suggest "...a second radiator connected to the first radiator, spaced from the first radiator, extending, unsupported, in the first direction, and having an end connected to an antenna cable" as recited in independent claim 1. Hayes does not teach or suggest, "...an antenna cable connected to a second end of the second radiator" as recited in independent claim 8.

First, the Examiner acknowledges that the alleged first radiator 42b is connected to the alleged ground plane 43. Second, the Examiner acknowledges that the second radiator is allegedly element 42a. The Examiner asserts, "a second radiator (Figure 4A element 42a) [is] connected to the first radiator (as shown in Figure 4A elements 42a and 42b)." Third in the drawings 4A-4C, Hayes shows that the signal feed 44 is only connected to the first radiator 42b. Although the first radiator 42b and the second radiator 42a extend in the same direction, the second radiator is not connected to an antenna cable. Thus, it is impossible for Hayes to teach or suggest the alleged second radiator 42a "having an end connected to an antenna cable" as

recited in independent claim 1. Claim 8 recites, "...an antenna cable connected to a second end of the second radiator." Hayes shows in figures 4A-C only the first radiator 42b connected to the signal feed 44. Therefore, Hayes does not teach or suggest, "...an antenna cable connected to a second end of the second radiator" as recited in independent claim 8.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

In the Office Action, at page 4, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 15-20, and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayes in view of Masaki et al. (6,388,627). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. Applicant traverses this rejection and respectfully requests reconsideration.

In the Office Action, at page 8, the Examiner rejected claims 4-5 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayes in view of Masaki and further in view of Tsai (U.S. Patent No. 6,486,834).

In the Office Action, at page 9, the Examiner rejected claims 3 and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayes in view of Masaki and further in view of Hachiga et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,896,109).

In the Office Action, at page 10, the Examiner rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayes in view of Hachiga.

In the Office action, at page 11, the Examiner rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayes in view of Tai (US Pub. No. 2003/0234742).

On page 14 of the Office Action, the examiner asserts that "Masaki suggests the use of inverted F antenna in the portable computer, which proves that [the] F antenna is suitable in this kind of device." The Examiner has failed to provide evidence that the motivation to combine Hayes and Masaki in the manner suggested by the Examiner exists in the prior art or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, and thus, that the Examiner has not provided sufficient evidence to maintain a *prima facie* obviousness rejection of the claims. The statements made by the Examiner amount to no more than conclusory statements of generalized advantages and convenient assumptions about skilled artisans. Such conclusory statements and assumptions are inadequate to support a finding of motivation, which is a factual question that cannot be resolved on subjective belief and unknown authority. Therefore, the Examiner has not provided sufficient evidence to maintain a *prima facie* obviousness rejection of the claims.

As such, the Applicant respectfully submits that the combination does not disclose or suggest the invention as recited in claims 2 and 15-25, and that there is insufficient evidence of a motivation that existed in the prior art and which would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to make the combination in the manner set forth in the office action.

The cited references, individually or combined, do not teach or suggest the feature found in independent claims 1, 8, 15, or 25 of an antenna cable connected to the second radiator.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all outstanding rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the cited art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited and possibly concluded by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss any such remaining issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 28 2006 By: M.J.H.
Mark J. Henry
Registration No. 36,162

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501